

IN THE CLAIMS

**The following claim listing replaces all previous versions, and listings, of the claims in the present application:**

1. (currently amended) An endoscope comprising:

a treatment instrument channel; and

an endoscopic spraying instrument comprising:

a liquid supplying tube configured to pass liquid therethrough and further configured to be removably inserted into the treatment instrument channel;

a rotatingly guiding groove disposed at a leading end side of the supplying tube is and configured to rotate the liquid about a central axis;

a liquid rotating chamber disposed at a leading end side of the rotatingly guiding groove, the liquid rotating chamber configured to rotate the liquid therein;

a spray nozzle formed in a leading end wall of the liquid rotating chamber and configured to discharge the liquid from the liquid rotating chamber; and

~~an annular, protruded wall spaced outwardly from an outer periphery of the spray nozzle, the wall protruded forwardly from and surrounding an exit of the spray nozzle, wherein a wall surface outwardly extending between the from an outer periphery of the spray nozzle and the annular, protruded wall is and defined by one of a tapered surface and a curved, concave surface; and~~

an annular, protruded wall extending in a forward direction and at an angle different from said wall surface.

2. (canceled)

P20361.A11

3. (previously presented) The endoscope of claim 1, wherein a portion of said wall surface ~~extending between the outer periphery of the spray nozzle and the annular, protruded wall~~ is defined by a planar surface perpendicular to an axis of the spray nozzle.

4. (currently amended) The endoscope of claim 1, wherein a portion of said wall surface ~~of the annular, protruded wall~~ is parallel to an axis of the spray nozzle.

5. (currently amended) The endoscope of claim 1, wherein a said wall surface ~~of the annular, protruded wall~~ is defined by a forwardly spread surface or a forwardly constricted surface.

6. (canceled)

7. (canceled)

8. (canceled)

9. (canceled)

10. (canceled)

11. (canceled)

12. (canceled)

13. (canceled)

14. (canceled)

15. (canceled)

16. (canceled)

17-28. (not entered)

29. (previously presented) The endoscope of claim 1, wherein the liquid supplying tube is substantially coaxial with the spray nozzle.

P20361.A11

30. (canceled)

31. (canceled)

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Applicants wish to express appreciation to Examiners Lam and Le for the interview of May 24, 2005. During the interview, Applicants' representative, Attorney William Boshnick, spoke to the Examiners concerning the rejected claims of the present invention.

Attorney Boshnick explained to the Examiners that a feature the present invention provides an annular, protruded wall which helps to more uniformly spray liquid. Specifically, Attorney Boshnick noted that a portion of the ejected liquid is able to collide with and be reflected by the annular protruded wall, thereby more uniformly spraying liquid (as shown, *inter alia*, in Fig. 1 and discussed, *inter alia*, in the Specification at page 2, line 20 through page 3, line 5). In contrast, Attorney Boshnick explained, the Applied SHIMIZU and NITA references more closely resemble the prior art shown in Figs. 5-6 of the present application. Specifically, such prior art devices lack at least the claimed annular, protruded wall, and as such (as described in Applicants' Specification at, *inter alia*, page 2, lines 7-15 and as described in Applicants' previous responses), may cause liquid to be non-uniformly sprayed in various directions, due to processing or assembly errors, or due to the presence of dust in the device. Additionally, the prior art devices may cause some of the sprayed liquid to flow down and along the outer surface, thereby making the spraying unstable (also as described in Applicants' Specification at, *inter alia*, page 2, lines 7-15).

The Examiners agreed that the applied prior art devices appeared not to teach or suggest such an annular, protruded wall, but indicated that the last limitation of claim 1 was somewhat unclear, and requested that Applicants rewrite claim 1 for purposes of clarification, and which would then more clearly overcome the prior art of record. While Attorney Boshnick noted that Applicants

P20361.A11

believe that the present claims are clear and allowable without any further amendment, he noted that Applicants would be willing to amend claim 1 solely to expedite the patent examination process. Applicants note that the amendment to claim 1 is substantially the same as that presented to the Examiners at the interview.